

SPEECH

*on custom*  
OF

HON. J. W. TIBBATTS, OF KENTUCKY,

*1802 - 1852*

ON

THE BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR

THE CUMBERLAND ROAD.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1846.

---

WASHINGTON :

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF BLAIR AND RIVES.

1846.

HO 51 58

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries



## CUMBERLAND ROAD.

The Bill making an appropriation for the completion of the Cumberland Road being under consideration in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. TIBBATTS addressed the committee as follows:

It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to make what is called a speech on the present occasion. It was not my intention to say anything in relation to this bill. Nor should I have sought the floor, but for some remarks which have fallen from the two gentlemen from Alabama, [Mr. PAYNE and Mr. YANCEY,] who have just addressed the committee. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PAYNE] who spoke first, has taken occasion to chide very freely the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CALEB B. SMITH] for the position which he has assumed, in agreeing to take an appropriation of land, instead of money, for the completion of the Cumberland Road. He considers that the gentleman from Indiana has let himself down from his usual high bearing, and become a beggar for a boon from Congress. He deprecates such a course on the part of the Representative on this floor; advises that the States should not humble themselves before the National Government; and feels assured that his own State will never stoop from her proud position to ask a boon from Congress.

This is all very well, Mr. Chairman; but it seems to me that it is very unfortunate, either for the Legislature of Alabama or for the gentleman from Alabama himself, that he did not make his speech at an earlier period, or that he made such a speech at all. I happen to hold in my hand a joint memorial of the Legislature of Alabama, referred at this session to the Committee on Commerce, and on which I have been directed by that committee to make a report, from which I will take the liberty of reading a few extracts, to which I will call the attention of the committee. The title of this paper is as follows:

*"Joint Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Alabama to the Congress of the United States, on the subject of deepening the channel of Mobile Bay and opening the Iberville river."*—See Doc. No. 156, 1st session 29th Congress.

This memorial, after representing that the good people of the State of Alabama are subjected to an

enormous tax upon their commerce, in consequence of the want of a sufficient depth of water at the Dog River and Choctaw Pass, bars in the Mobile Bay, to admit the ships engaged in the commerce of that city to pass, by being compelled to pay lighterage, which operates as an embarrassment upon their commerce, and a direct tax upon the industry of the people of that State, says:

"Your memorialists would therefore pray your honorable bodies to take the subject into immediate consideration, and make such appropriations as will ensure the deepening of the channel, through these bars, to a depth that will allow the passage of vessels drawing fourteen feet at low water, and the construction of jetties across the heads of the Tensaw and Spanish rivers, branches of the Mobile river, in such a manner as to throw an increased volume of the river into the main channel which passes the city of Mobile."

Thus it appears that the Legislature of Alabama is of opinion that Congress has the constitutional power to make appropriations for the improvement of *harbors*; but that is not all: the memorial goes on to say:

"Your memorialists would further call the attention of Congress to the importance of re-opening the river Iberville, or Manchac, in Louisiana, which formerly connected the Lake Pontchartrain, by way of Lake Maurepas, with the Mississippi river at a point a short distance below the town of Baton Rouge."

"Your memorialists would therefore respectfully urge your honorable bodies to cause the navigation of the Iberville to be re-opened, by removing the obstructions which have been placed in it by your own representative, and the removal of such other impediments as may have been subsequently added by private hands."

Here, too, the Legislature of Alabama expresses the opinion, that Congress has the constitutional power to make appropriations for the improvement of rivers. The Legislature of Alabama does not think that it lessens its dignity by asking of Congress appropriations for these objects: nor do I think so either. The objects being proper, it is due to the people of Alabama that the appropriation should be made; and I can see no degradation on the part of the Legislature of that State in calling the attention of Congress to the matter, and asking for appropriations. This memorial concludes with the following resolution:

*"Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Alabama in General Assembly convened, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to use their best exertions to carry into*



effect the views contained in the foregoing memorial; and that his Excellency the Governor cause copies of this memorial and resolution to be forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives.

"JOHN A. WINSTON,  
"President of the Senate.

"A. B. MOORE,  
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

I presume that the gentlemen from Alabama have been furnished with a copy of this document. From all this, I would infer, that the opinions expressed by the gentlemen from Alabama do not accord very well with the opinions of the Legislature of Alabama, in relation to the constitutional power of this Government to make appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

These resolutions are equally unfortunate for both the gentlemen from Alabama, as it is evident from them that the Legislature of Alabama entertains views in relation to the constitutional power of this Government to make appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and of the sound policy of such appropriations, wholly at variance with the views taken by these gentlemen.

But is it surprising, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Indiana should be willing to take an appropriation of land from the Government, which he hopes he may get, instead of an appropriation of money, which he seems to be satisfied he never can obtain? This is not the first time, sir, when the oppressed has been willing to receive from his oppressor less than what he believes himself to be justly entitled to. How often does it happen, that after a long course of litigation in pursuit of a just right, a party is not only willing but anxious to obtain by compromise less than he is justly entitled to—willing to take a part rather than risk the danger of losing the whole, by the undue influence, or power, or injustice of his adversary? Sir, the people of the western States interested in this road, have for a long time asked for the performance of a solemn contract entered into by this Government in relation to this road. Justice has often been denied them. Despairing to get money, they are willing to take land, nay, anxious to get it. This is not at all surprising. Unhappily for the honor of human nature, it is but an every-day occurrence;—or, unfortunately, so far as regards the interests and just rights of the western country, it is no wonder in this House.

Either the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PAYNE] or I have made some mistake in our reading and understanding the writings of Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Mr. Monroe, and General Jackson. He says that he is protected by the shield of those great names, in the view he takes of the want of constitutional power of this Government to make appropriations for the improvement of harbors and rivers. I believe that the Government does possess this power, and have considered that my belief and my action on that subject, in my support of the harbor and river bill, are in perfect consonance with the opinions and the actions of all these great men. One of us must be mistaken, sir, since we arrive at such opposite conclusions from the same premises. I think, sir, that the honorable gentleman is laboring under a very great error in this matter. I am satisfied that neither Mr. Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, or Jackson, entertained any

such opinions as those attributed to them by the gentleman from Alabama; and that he can in no degree protect himself in the opinions he expresses under the shield of any one of those great names.

[Mr. PAYNE interposed, and (Mr. T. yielding the floor) said, by the permission of the gentleman from Kentucky, I am permitted to read an extract from the writings of Mr. Jefferson, which constitutes the shield which protected him in the supposed novelty of the doctrine advanced by him some days ago. This is the extract:

"I consider the foundation of the Constitution, as laid on this ground: all powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people. *To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition.*"

The power to dig a canal, build a road, or improve a river, is not among the enumerated powers. If, then, Congress attempts to do either, we take possession of a boundless field of power no longer susceptible of any definition.]

Mr. TIBBATS resumed. I am well conversant with the sentiment expressed by Mr. Jefferson in the extract which the gentleman from Alabama has read. I fully agree with that sentiment; it is clearly laid down in the Constitution itself. But it does not bear the gentleman out in the positions he assumes. I do not intend, sir, to go into an elaborate argument upon the constitutional powers of the Government in relation to this subject. I did that the other day upon the bill making appropriations for the improvement of harbors and rivers. I have written out my remarks upon that occasion; they are now in the hands of the printer, and I hope they will appear in the papers in a few days, and must content myself to refer to them. All I wish on the present occasion is, to call the attention of the committee, and of the gentleman from Alabama, to a few leading principles which govern this matter.

The Constitution, in the first clause of the eighth section of the first article, gives to Congress an unlimited power to lay taxes, &c., for the purpose of raising revenue. This power is unrestricted, except in the discretion of Congress. The only check to this discretion is in the responsibility of the Representatives to their constituents. The same clause defines the objects to which Congress should look, in the exercise of the power to raise revenue, "to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare;" and clearly confers the power to appropriate the public moneys. This power of appropriation to the national objects contemplated and defined by the Constitution, is equally unlimited with the power to raise revenue. But there is a *third* power, sir, to which I wish particularly to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama—the power of carrying the appropriation into effect. The power of appropriating money simply, is a very different power from the power of carrying the appropriation into effect, by expending the money upon the object for which the appropriation was made.

This latter power of carrying the appropriation into effect is to be viewed in two aspects. First, when it leaves the jurisdiction and sovereignty over the object of the improvement in the hands of



the States; and, secondly, when it attempts to assume a jurisdiction and sovereignty in the hands of the General Government.

This distinction was taken and clearly laid down by Mr. Monroe in relation to this very Cumberland Road. Mr. Monroe denied that Congress had the power to apply these appropriation by assuming a jurisdiction in the General Government so as to erect gates and charge tolls, &c., for the purpose of keeping the road in repair; and he recommended to Congress that an amendment should be made to the Constitution, which should confer this power upon Congress. But finding that this was not done, he afterwards recommended that the Executive should be empowered to make arrangements with the States through which the road should pass, that they might erect gates and charge toll, to keep the road in repair; which recommendation was afterwards adopted, and the arrangements made with the States. It is the denial of this power in the Government, to apply appropriations by assuming jurisdiction, made by Mr. Monroe and afterwards by General Jackson, which has misled the gentleman from Alabama upon this subject. I would recommend to that gentleman to re-read the opinions of those distinguished statesmen upon this subject. I am desirous that he will do so, for it may some day happen that the people of the West might wish to make some use of him—he has taken a distinguished stand in the councils of the nation. I am satisfied, that if he will give this subject a fair and candid re-examination—if he will apply those powers of intellect which he undoubtedly possesses to an unbiassed and unprejudiced examination into the constitutional power of the Government, he will change his opinions upon this subject. This, it is true, as Mr. Jefferson says, is a Government of delegated and limited power, and it has no right to go a step beyond the powers which have been specially delegated to it; but the power to make this appropriation is as specially delegated as a power can be in an instrument of that character. It would have been impossible to have specified in that instrument everything *in totidem verbis* which Congress could do in carrying into effect the granted powers: to do that would have made a library which would have filled this Hall. Congress clearly has the power to appropriate money to make a great military road or post road, such as this Cumberland road is, to connect the country on the Atlantic with that of the Mississippi. The nationality of this measure cannot be doubted. Where the point of nationality begins, and where it ends, in relation to matters of this kind, it is true, cannot be clearly defined: this, as to some measures, must be left to the sound discretion of Congress. But there are some objects of improvement which are clearly local, about which no mistake can be made; there are others, again, which are clearly national in their character, about which no doubt can exist; and the Cumberland road is one of these. Neither Jefferson nor Madison nor Monroe nor Jackson nor Van Buren, had any doubt about the power of Congress to make appropriations for the erection of this road. We may differ about the opinions of men after reading their writings—we may place different constructions upon what they may say;

but surely we must allow their actions to be the interpreter of their meaning—acts speak louder than words, and do not admit of misconstruction. Surely the gentleman cannot contend that he is protecting himself under the opinion of Mr. Jefferson, when he denies the constitutional power to make this appropriation, when Mr. Jefferson himself signed the very bill which made the first appropriation for the erection of this very road. Neither can he protect himself under the shield of Madison, or Monroe, or Jackson, or Van Buren; for they all signed bills making appropriations to this identical Cumberland road—all, all of them, sir.

Sir, this power is too clear, has been too often exercised, to admit of doubt. The people of the West will never surrender a power which is of such vital importance to their interests. The gentlemen from the South, then, who oppose these appropriations with so much zeal, had better review their opinions upon this subject. To construe the Constitution as they would have us view it, we could not move a single step. The Constitution would be a dead letter. These gentlemen had better abandon such impracticable views, and unite with us of the West in making fair and reasonable appropriations for such objects of internal improvement as our situation imperatively requires.

This Cumberland road was commenced, sir, in 1806, under the Administration of Mr. Jefferson: appropriations have been made by Congress for its construction during every successive Administration down to the present time. From 1806 to 1845, laws, to the number of *forty-six*, have passed Congress, making these appropriations. These bills have received the sanction of all of the Presidents except Mr. Tyler, from the commencement of the road until now. The appropriation for this road, at the last session of Congress, was in the general appropriation bill, which received the "*pocket veto*" of Mr. Tyler; not, as I have understood, on account of that appropriation, but on account of some appropriations made by the bill to some objects of minor importance in the eastern States. Gentlemen who oppose this bill cannot doubt that the patriots and statesmen who have been called to preside over the destinies of this nation understood the Constitution. They cannot believe that such men would have violated that sacred instrument, by sanctioning a bill which they believed was unconstitutional. This work has been in progress for more than forty years. It is too late, sir, for gentlemen to raise this constitutional impediment to its passage. It is time, sir, that this question of constitutional power, so far as regards this bill at least, was at rest—the question should be considered as settled.

[Mr. LEAKE, of Virginia, here inquired of Mr. T., whether, in the event of a State objecting to the construction of the road within her limits, Congress could nevertheless proceed with it?]

Mr. T. replied: Undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman, the power "to establish post roads" comprehends the right to make or construct any roads which Congress may deem proper for the conveyance of the mail, and to keep them in repair for that purpose. This is not a question of implied power, but of express power. No State has the right to



obstruct Congress in the exercise of it; under any other interpretation the power would be a nullity.

[Mr. LEAKE then inquired whether, in such case, the exercise of such power by Congress would not be to assume jurisdiction within the limits of such State?]

Mr. T. resumed. Not at all, sir. If Congress should lay out and construct a post road within a State, the road would still be within the ordinary territorial jurisdiction of the State. The right of territory and jurisdiction—the sovereignty, civilly and criminally—would still be complete and perfect in the State government; as completely so as it is over places purchased by Congress for the purpose of erecting forts, arsenals, dock-yards, hospitals, custom-houses, or court-houses. Congress has the power to purchase places for the erection of such improvements and uses; the jurisdiction and sovereignty over them, however, is still in the States. The purchase of them and the erection of the buildings does not remove them from the jurisdiction and sovereignty of the States. Congress does not, by such purchase, assume or acquire any sovereignty, but merely a use, subject to the sovereignty of the State. It is the same with a post road: Congress acquires a right to use the road for public purposes; this is still subject to the sovereignty of the State, and does not interfere with it.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another view to be taken of the subject under consideration. Among the propositions submitted by Congress, in the act of the 30th April, 1802, to the convention of Ohio, was the following:

“*Third.* That one-twentieth of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said State, sold by Congress from and after the thirtieth day of June next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be applied to the laying out and making public roads leading from the navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic to the Ohio, to the said State, and through the same; said roads to be laid out under the authority of Congress, with the consent of the several States through which the road shall pass; provided, always, that the three foregoing propositions herein offered are on the condition that the convention of the said State shall provide, by an ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by Congress from and after the thirtieth day of June next, shall be and remain exempt from any tax laid by order or under authority of the State, whether for State, county, or township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the day of sale.”

This proposition was so modified by the act of the 3d of March, 1803, as that three-fifths of the reservation for roads should be expended by the State within the State, and two-fifths should be appropriated by Congress to roads “*leading to and through the State.*” Under the act of the 19th of April, 1816, for the admission of the State of Indiana into the Union, it is provided:

“That five per cent. of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said territory, and which shall be sold by Congress from and after the first day of December next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads and canals, of which three-fifths shall be applied to those objects within the said State under the direction of the Legislature thereof, and two-fifths to the making of a road or roads leading to the said State, under the direction of Congress.”

In the act of the 18th April, 1818, for the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union, there is a similar provision to that in relation to the State of Indiana; the same provision is made in the

act of the 6th March, 1820, for the admission of the State of Missouri into the Union. Here are four legislative compacts, solemnly made by Congress with these four States. That Congress was constitutionally competent to make these compacts, I presume no gentleman will doubt.

This question presents itself, whether, upon the considerations expressed in these several compacts, the Government of the United States undertook to make a road leading *to and through these States*, or was the undertaking of the Government only to expend the two per cent. fund *towards* that object?

The gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. YANCEY,] contends that the United States only undertook to expend the two per cent. fund towards that object; that more than the amount of that fund has been expended, and that the United States has fully complied with its contract.

I differ with that gentleman upon this subject. I maintain, sir, that, upon a fair and just interpretation of these compacts, taken in connexion with the action of the Government since, and the circumstances existing at the time the compacts were made, no other legitimate view can be taken of them than that the undertaking of the United States was to construct the road to and through those States, without regard to the amount of the two per cent. fund; that the intention of the contracting parties was, that the Government of the United States was to be bound to make the road, and that the two per cent. fund was regarded to be only in aid of the work. The road was considered as one of the greatest importance, as a mail route and as a military road. At that time, it is true, it was of more importance in that point of view than it is now, owing to the improvements of the navigation of the Ohio, the application of steam to that navigation, and the very great improvements which have been made in the construction of steam vessels for that purpose. But the road still is one of great national importance as a post route and military road, and may become indispensably necessary at such times as the navigation of the Ohio is obstructed by ice.

The Government, at that time, owned in those States more than a hundred millions of acres of land; this road was of great importance with the view to the sale and settlement of those lands, and to give them value; the Government would thus derive very great advantages and large revenues, resulting from the construction of the road. The authorities had viewed all these matters fully. Estimates of the cost of the road were made. The cost of the construction of the road from Cumberland to Wheeling, a distance of seventy miles, was estimated by Mr. Gallatin at \$6,000 per mile. At this rate the cost of the road from Cumberland to the Mississippi, a distance of six hundred and fifty miles, would be \$3,900,000; a sum greatly less than would have been derived to the States from the taxes for five years, which they relinquished, and which it is calculated would have amounted to at least \$5,000,000. It is true that the work, so far as it has progressed, has cost greatly more than the estimate; but this will not vary the contract. Much of the expenditures upon the road has been wasteful and extravagant; but over these the States have had no control whatever; they have been



exclusively under the control of the General Government. If they have been wasted, this Government alone is to blame, and the States cannot in justice be made to suffer for it. This Government was, so far as the two per cent. fund was concerned, a trustee for the States; and if the fund was extravagantly and wastefully expended, by the neglect and mismanagement of its own officers, this Government is responsible for the trust. Besides, the Government had made its surveys and calculations, and estimated the cost; had adopted its plans upon consideration of the whole matter; and if it made a bad bargain, it is none the less bound by it. Under such circumstances, the compacts were made, and the road commenced. If the two per cent. fund was not sufficient, the Government did not intend to rely upon it for the completion of the road, or (which no man can believe) a fraud was practised upon the States. More than the whole of the two per cent. fund was expended in Maryland and Pennsylvania and Virginia, before the road even reached the Ohio: where then would have been the sense in Illinois or Missouri making such a contract? Where is the justice or fairness in giving the contract such a construction? But it is contended that the acts making appropriations to this road, provide that they shall be reimbursed out of the two per cent. fund. If this were true, it would amount to nothing; it would be but an after thought, an *ex parte* act on the part of this Government, which the States could not control and were not bound by, and which could not vary the original contract. But this is not true in point of fact: the act of 1806, which is the first upon this subject, pays no regard to the two per cent. fund. The message of Mr. Jefferson of the 19th of February, 1808, shows that it was *then* contemplated by this Government to carry the road through to the Mississippi. He says:

"In forming this decision, [the point at which the road should strike the Ohio,] I shall pay material regard to the interests and wishes of the populous parts of the State of Ohio, and to a future and convenient connection with the road which is to lead from the Indian boundary near Cincinnati by Vincennes to the Mississippi, at St. Louis, under authority of the act of 21st April, 1806. In this way we may accomplish a continued and advantageous line of communication from the seat of the General Government to St. Louis, passing through many interesting points of the western country."

The act of the 14th April, 1818, did not provide that the appropriation then made of \$312,914 should be reimbursed out of the two per cent. fund. The appropriations of 1819, 1820, and 1845, were in the general appropriation bills, and no such reservation attached to them. The preamble to the act of 1820, which directed the survey from Wheeling to the Mississippi, shows that one of the chief objects of the General Government in the construction of this road was to enhance the value of the public lands in the West; for at that time more than five times the amount of the two per cent. fund had been expended in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

All the acts of this Government go to show that the Government intended to make this road to the Mississippi. The Government has thus held out to the hardy and honest yeomanry of the West inducements to purchase and settle upon the lands on and near this road; which they have done at

great risk and labor, and made valuable improvements, with a view to the construction of this road. This fact adds to the contract of the Government an additional moral obligation, which ought to be faithfully and strictly complied with. The Government is bound by its acts and its compacts to complete this road, cost what it may. It cannot refuse to do it without repudiating a solemn obligation, without a breach of good faith, and without doing great and grievous injustice to the people of the West, who are interested in it, and who have been induced by that expectation to purchase and settle upon, and improve the public domain. Will gentlemen place this Government in that position by refusing this appropriation? I hope not, sir.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. YANCEY] says that the people of the West have no right to complain of the opposition of southern members to this and other bills proposing appropriations in the West. He thinks that the General Government has been very liberal to the West, and he exhibits a table, showing that a large amount of the public lands have been given to the western States for various purposes. What were those lands worth, sir, but for the valor, the enterprise, and the courage of the people of the West? It was their toil and blood that won them from the savage allies of Great Britain, who held on to them after the treaty of peace of 1783, and you did not get them until 1794, when they were wrested from the savages by the brave pioneers of the West. But for their valor you would not have had them, and but for their enterprise they would have been worthless; they, under all kinds of danger and hardship, penetrated the wilderness, and settled upon these lands, and thereby gave them value. But I have been looking into the table referred to by the gentleman, to ascertain what portion of this liberality has fallen to the lot of the State of Kentucky, which I have the honor in part to represent. The members from Kentucky on this floor have in all times been liberal in voting appropriations to other parts of the Union. They have acted with an open hand. And how much land do you suppose, sir, is shown by this table to have been bestowed by the generous munificence of this Government upon the State of Kentucky? Not an acre, sir. And, sir, if I remember correctly, an appropriation of a township of land to a deaf and dumb asylum at Danville, and some small appropriation for a military post at Newport, will make the sum total of all the munificent liberality of this Government to the State of Kentucky; whilst we have been voting millions upon millions annually, to be expended for the benefit of the East and South. Blot out, sir, the insignificant appropriations I have alluded to, and no monument would be left that Kentucky was ever a member of this Confederacy, except upon your battle-fields, where her brave sons have perished in defence of the country.

It is strange, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen from the South should make such violent opposition to the appropriations which are asked for by the people of the West. It is not only this bill which is opposed by them, but their opposition was equally violent the other day to "the harbor and river bill." They opposed that strongly, because it did not appropriate as much to the South



as to the West and North; but when the bill making appropriations for fortifications was up the other day, these gentlemen did not complain, or even suggest that the appropriations in that bill were comparatively nothing for the West, and almost all for the East and the South. No, no, sir; not they, not at all, sir. Western members, however, did not complain. They knew that the Secretary of War had recommended the appropriations; that they were sanctioned by the Executive; and that the Committee of Ways and Means, after examining the subject, had reported and recommended the passage of the bill, and we voted for it, without asking any questions. We did not object, or complain, that the bill did not appropriate as much money to the West as it did for the South.

[Here Mr. YANCEY said, that he should remind Mr. T., that he and his colleague [Mr. PAYNE] had opposed the "harbor and river bill" upon constitutional grounds.]

I am well aware of that, Mr. Chairman. I did not say that the only ground of objection which was made to that bill was that of an unequal distribution of the public money. I do not recollect distinctly the ground which that gentleman took in relation to that point; but it will be recollected distinctly that one of the principal objections which was urged against the bill by his colleague was, that the bill did not appropriate as much money south of Mason and Dixon's line as it did north of it. I wish to show, before I sit down, how improper such objections are, and to what little weight they are entitled. Now, sir, in Kentucky, we have no use for fortifications; we never expect to see an enemy within our border, unless as a prisoner of war; appropriations, therefore, for the erection of fortifications in Kentucky, would be

entirely preposterous. What would gentlemen have thought, then, if a Representative from Kentucky had urged an opposition to the fortification bill, because it did not appropriate an equal proportion of the money proposed to be expended to the erection of fortifications in the State of Kentucky? Or what, if a Representative from Kentucky should oppose the naval appropriation bill, because it does not appropriate money to be expended for the navy in Kentucky, where we have no water to float it upon, and no use for any, if we had? I put these questions to the candor of gentlemen. The opposition which they make to the appropriations for the improvement of the great navigable rivers and harbors in the West is equally misplaced and unjust. Besides, sir, it is nothing more nor less than a system of extravagant and useless expenditure of the public money, without regard to the propriety or necessity of the appropriations which they are urging upon us. Every measure should be considered in regard to its own propriety, without regard to the section of country in which the money is to be expended. We of the West vote, and we vote with an open hand, for the appropriation of money for the erection of fortifications on the seaboard, and for the maintenance of a navy, because the objects are proper, and we all have a national interest in them; and they are such kind of appropriations as are proper to be expended in the East. For the very same reasons, gentlemen from the East and South should support and not oppose the appropriations asked for by the West. They, too, are of national concern, and such as are required by the condition of things in the West, and suitable to that locality. I will not detain the committee any longer, sir, having in fact said more than I had intended to do when I took the floor.